

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113
Final Office Action Date: 12/30/2008

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed December 30, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 3-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/18066 to Bender et al. (hereinafter Bender) in view of US 2005/0157732 to Joy et al. (hereinafter Joy) and the admitted prior art ("APA") as disclosed by the Applicant in the specification FIG. 1, page 1, lines 12-22. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

In an effort to further prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 14-16 to further clarify the characteristics of the access point as presently claimed, namely to recite, *inter alia*: "separately registering to the wireless access point with their respective MAC addresses, the device and the bridge device as wireless devices on the wireless network..."

The Examiner states in the Response to Arguments that "Bender clearly discloses a wireless modem (bridge device) is used to connect a wire-line broadcast medium terminal equipment unit, such as an Ethernet unit, to a network unit (access point) over a wireless link (as wireless devices). Both the terminal equipment unit 40 (non-wireless)

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113
Final Office Action Date: 12/30/2008

and the wireless modem 42 use their unique hardware address to request separate IP address over wireless link connection (registering in the wireless network system implies registering the wired and wireless terminals as wireless devices).”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The ‘access point’ (network unit 58) cited in Bender does not disclose or suggest, and is not equivalent to, the wireless access point, as presently claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16. Significantly, note that the ‘access point’ of Bender is a combination of a network unit 58 and a network remote server 60. The network unit 58 is wirelessly connected to the wireless modem 42. However, the network unit 58 and network remote server 60 do not constitute a wireless network. Accordingly, the ‘access point’ of Bender is not an access point of a wireless network, and Bender fails to disclose or suggest at least a wireless network comprising a wireless access point.

Moreover, neither Bender, the APA or Joy disclose or suggest that the device and the bridge device are separately registered to the wireless access point with their respective MAC addresses as wireless devices on the wireless network, as essentially recited in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16. In Bender, only the wireless modem 42 is registered as a wireless device to the network unit 58. The wireless link of Bender is a point to point wireless link. The device 40 is recorded to the access point with an IP address and hardware address. Bender’s device 40 is not registered as a wireless device to an access point, much less a wireless access point.

Further, the Applicant notes that the registration of a device to an access point is not to be confused with recording by obtaining an IP address. Bender teaches that the wireless modem 42 and the terminal equipment 40 are **recorded** to the access point (58,

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113
Final Office Action Date: 12/30/2008

60) with their IP and hardware addresses. Insofar as any "registration" is concerned, 42 and 40 are registered at Bender's 'access point' as **network** devices that are addressable at their respective addresses.

To elaborate, it is emphasized that the equipment unit 40 of Bender is not registered as a wireless device at the access point; instead it is recorded at the access point, as being **addressable through the wireless modem device** through the point to point wireless link 56. This is different from, and does not disclose or suggest, being **addressable as a wireless device on a wireless network**, as presently claimed.

Indeed, the alleged 'bridge device' of Bender (wireless modem 42) does not have the structure to perform the registration of a 'device' (terminal equipment unit 40) and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network to the access point. On page 7, Bender only indicates that the wireless modem 42 comprises a transceiver 46 that further comprises a wireless link communication module.

However, in the present specification it is indicated that some adaptation is necessary in a bridge device to support the registration method of the claimed embodiment. Clearly, the bridge device needs to manage multiple wireless connections concurrently; which is detailed in the present specification on pages 4-7.

In contrast, the transceiver of Bender does not and cannot perform registration of the first terminal equipment unit 40 and the wireless modem 42 as **wireless devices on a wireless network**. Instead, the wireless modem 42 of Bender only enables recording a device to an access point.

Therefore, the bridge device of Bender doesn't comprise means for carrying out two separate device registrations for registering the first device and the bridge device as

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113
Final Office Action Date: 12/30/2008

wireless devices on the wireless network, one for the bridge device, and one for the first device, using respective MAC addresses, wherein the registration is performed through an authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 14-16.

The APA and Joy, either individually or in any combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of Bender as applied to claims 1 and 14-16.

Therefore, claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 are patentable and nonobvious in view of Bender in view of Joy and/or the APA. Claims 3-13 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable as well for at least the same reasons as those discussed above. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection in view of Bender, Joy and the APA is respectfully requested.


Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113
Final Office Action Date: 12/30/2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Final Office Action of December 30, 2008 be withdrawn, that pending Claims 1 and 3-16 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

In the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Paul Kiel
Registration No. 40,677

Date: 4/29/09

Mailing Address:

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
PATENT OPERATIONS
P.O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312